

**From:** ChasNoulle@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 2:36 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast Rules

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

If the proposed "broadcast ownership rules" are adopted, independent voices in cities across the United States could be snuffed out by huge media corporations.

Whole communities, and even whole states and regions, could be dominated by one media company which could decide which viewpoints to allow on the air and which to censor.

The big media conglomerates have in the past used their power to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. These proposed rule changes would give them far greater power to keep opposing views off the air and out of the newspapers.

Many of the corporations that are fighting for these rule changes, including media giants Viacom/CBS and Disney/ABC, are precisely the same companies that have tried in the past to keep other viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Charles A. Noullet, Sr., Lacombe, LA

**From:** tjfedele@msn.com  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 2:45 PM  
**Subject:** Media Deregulation

Thank you for appearing on "Now" with Bill Moyers and informing the public about the proposed deregulation. I have great concerns about having the media controlled by a few large corporations, and I'm concerned it will interfere with free speech, as well as the "spin" that will be put on the news. I'm grateful for PBS which seems to be the only voice on this subject at this time. From what I have been hearing, FCC Chairman Powell seems to be closed minded on the subject. Is there anyone else I can right to to express my concerns?  
Thelma Fedele

**From:** RUSSO707@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 2:57 PM  
**Subject:** Media Owership(June 2nd Vote)

As a citizen of this country along with my family are very concerned about the proposed change in the FCC rules and regulations that will be decided for the up and coming vote on June 2nd that will drastically effect the way the people of this country receive their information.

The main concern is that there is not enough information about what is exactly being voted on, what are the details of the vote and the broad configuartion of what the new system will be.

I beleive more hearings along with further disclosure and with citizen partisapation needs to take place in a matter were the majorlty of the public is aware of the full scope and consequences of this major vote .

I have viewed the ideas suggested which have been expressed by Commissioner Michael J. Copps and concur with his proposals. Especially the part with keeping in concideration that the air waves are the people's property and any decision should be based on the interests of the citizens.

I hope that you rethink your decision not to hold hearings on this matter and listen to the other members on the board to come to a sound conclusion that benefits all who will be effected by your decisions.

Sincerely,  
Concerned Citizens:  
Dawn Russo  
Barbara Wise  
707 Marigold Drive  
Lady Lake FL 32159

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, klmweb@fcc.gov, jadlste@fcc.gov

**From:** RUSSO707@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 2:57 PM  
**Subject:** Media Owersnship(June 2nd Vote)

As a citizen of this country along with my family are very concerned about the proposed change in the FCC rules and regulations that will be decided for the up and coming vote on June 2nd that will drastically effect the way the people of this country receive their information.

The main concern is that there is not enough information about what is exactly being voted on, what are the details of the vote and the broad configuartion of what the new system will be.

I beleive more hearings along with further disclosure and with citizen partisapation needs to take place in a matter were the majorlty of the public is aware of the full scope and consequences of this major vote .

I have viewed the ideas suggested which have been expressed by Commissioner Michael J. Copps and concur with his proposals. Especially the part with keeping in concideration that the air waves are the people's property and any decision should be based on the interests of the citizens.

I hope that you rethink your decision not to hold hearings on this matter and listen to the other members on the board to come to a sound conclusion that benefits all who will be effected by your decisions.

Sincerely,  
Concerned Citizens:  
Dawn Russo  
Barbara Wise  
707 Marigold Drive  
Lady Lake FL 32159

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, klmweb@fcc.gov, jadtste@fcc.gov

**From:** Abigail van Alyn Booraem  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:01 PM  
**Subject:** Media concentration/deregulation

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in great alarm, to ask you to put on the brakes!

I strongly oppose any action that would further consolidate the power of the media in corporate hands. Further, I support Commissioner Copps in his efforts to open this question (the question: "In a democracy, who owns the airwaves?") to public debate and comment.

Fox News everywhere, all the time? No thank you!!

Abigail van Alyn Booraem

Abigail Van Alyn  
INTEGRAL COACHING Programs  
for Professional and Personal Mastery  
[www.abigailvanalyn.com](http://www.abigailvanalyn.com)

510-845-0648 phone  
510-845-2442 fax

"If success or failure of this planet and of human beings  
depended on how I am and what I do...  
How would I be?  
What would I do?"

R. Buckminster Fuller

**From:** Slarrydude@wmconnect.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:12 PM  
**Subject:** (no subject)

Dear Ms. Abernathy: I urge you to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep the opposing viewpoints off the air. The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to insure a healthy political debate in our country. Sincerely, Dude Starnes

**From:** mebane@mchsi.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:12 PM  
**Subject:** Media Monopolies

Dear Ms. Abernathy,

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near total control of radio and television news and information in communities across the nation. Many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Shawn Mebane  
1261 Brentwood Drive

Jamesville, NC 27846

**From:** mebane@mchsi.com  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:17 PM  
**Subject:** Media Monopolies

Dear Mr.Copps,

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near total control of radio and television news and information in communities across the nation. Many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Shawn Mebane  
1261 Brentwood Drive

Jamesville, NC 27846



**From:** Tom Morgan  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:20 PM  
**Subject:** media consolidation

Dear Ms. Abernathy,

In one of your upcoming meetings, May I believe, you may be taking a vote on allowing companies to own a greater share of media services within a market. I believe strongly that if you allow companies a greater market share that it will restrict media competition in the United States and will be doing a disservice to the public. In addition, I believe that the public doesn't completely understand this issue and hasn't had sufficient input.

Please vote against this proposal.

Sincerely,  
Tom Morgan

**From:** Joanne N Nagy  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:21 PM  
**Subject:** rule change

Dear Commissioner Copps,

Thank you for all your efforts on behalf of the American public.

I hope it is not too late to get more hearings funded and delay the vote on lifting the ownership cap past June 2, 2003.

Sincerely,

Joanne Nagy  
16500 Simonds Street  
Granada Hills, CA 91344  
818-363-4016  
jnn@juno.com

**From:** Abigail van Alyn Booraem  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:22 PM  
**Subject:** media concentration

Dear Commissioner Copps,

I saw you Friday night on NOW and was galvanized into action. Thank you for the work you are doing to bring this vitally important matter to the public's attention.

I'm attaching the email I've sent to your fellow commissioners.

Thanks again...

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in great alarm, to ask you to put on the brakes!

I strongly oppose any action that would further consolidate the power of the media in corporate hands. Further, I support Commissioner Copps in his efforts to open this question (the question: "In a democracy, who owns the airwaves?") to public debate and comment.

Fox News everywhere, all the time? No thank you!!

Abigail van Alyn Booraem

Abigail Van Alyn  
INTEGRAL COACHING Programs  
Practices for Personal and Professional Mastery  
[www.abigailvanalyn.com](http://www.abigailvanalyn.com)  
510-845-0648 ph  
510-845-2442 fx

"Tell me, what is it you plan to do with your one wild and precious life?"  
Mary Oliver

**From:** Tom Morgan  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:24 PM  
**Subject:** media expansion

Dear Commissioner Copps,

I have been watching the possibility of the media expansion recently and saw your interview with Bill Moyers. I have written the other commissioners and your chairman to encourage them to vote against this expansion. I think that it will do a great disservice to the public. I encourage you to continue your strong opposition to this proposal.

Sincerely,  
Tom Morgan

**From:** westmacott@fordham.edu  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:30 PM  
**Subject:** don't deregulate any more of our airwaves

To the Federal Communications Committee:

You probably do not know me but I am a U.S. citizen and partial owner of the airwaves that you regulate. Therefore, you work for me. I am writing to inform you that I am already disgusted enough with the monoculture being presented in my media that you have sold away. The only respite I can get from the profit-driven sludge that is force-fed to me everyday is from public and independent media. (This is sad considering that ALL media is theoretically publically owned - it would not be possible without our airwaves.) Imagine my dismay when I learned that you were considering whether or not to completely eliminate governmental restrictions on the number of media outlets that one company can own. Why would that be a good idea? I mean, I understand that you and your friends would make some more money, but I really don't think that should be the criteria upon which you make this decision. I'm sorry but I'm not dumb enough to believe that the 50 largest media companies spending \$111.3 million to influence Congress and the executive branch between 1996 and 2000 is "free-market capitalism." They look at these expenses as an investment - they would not have spent that money unless they thought that they would get a good return on it. For example, the Broadcasting Industry contributed five million dollars to the campaigns of George W. Bush and Al Gore (they contributed to both to hedge their bets, I don't blame them, why pick a side when it could cost you?) For this investment the industry got free digital TV licenses - a seventy billion dollar value! That's a 1,400,000% return on their investment! And let's not forget that the \$111.3 million had to go somewhere. Now, a hundred million dollars may seem paltry to you, but in the real world that's a lot of money. I know a lot of people who could use that money for much needed food (in 1999, 31 million Americans (12 million of whom were children) were food insecure, meaning they were either hungry or unsure of where their next meal would come from), housing, or healthcare (about 43 million Americans don't have any). But I'm sure they would understand if you and your friends felt that you needed another car or another house or a new swimming pool or whatever you spent your kickback on.

So, the bottom line is that deregulation will not help the public at all, and we know it. I cannot even begin to tell you how many emails I've gotten (some from people I haven't heard from in years who have NEVER taken an interest in anything political before) about how upsetting it is that you would even consider this move. Yes, we're on to you. So don't give away anymore of our airwaves. Keep the restrictions on how many media outlets one company can own (in fact, increase the restrictions). Decreasing the restrictions only means that we get less points of view and less options in our media - and that's not freedom of the press.

Oh, and while you're at it, increase funding for the Public Broadcasting System, the National Public Radio, and the National Endowment for the Arts. Those are all things that the public actually wants. If I hear about you messing with any of those...

Incredibly pissed off and watching your every move,  
Johannah Westmacott

155 W. 60th, 7K1  
New York, NY 10023

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy

**From:** westmacott@fordham.edu  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:30 PM  
**Subject:** don't deregulate any more of our airwaves

To the Federal Communications Committee:

You probably do not know me but I am a U.S. citizen and partial owner of the airwaves that you regulate. Therefore, you work for me. I am writing to inform you that I am already disgusted enough with the monoculture being presented in my media that you have sold away. The only respite I can get from the profit-driven sludge that is force-fed to me everyday is from public and independent media. (This is sad considering that ALL media is theoretically publically owned - it would not be possible without our airwaves.) Imagine my dismay when I learned that you were considering whether or not to completely eliminate governmental restrictions on the number of media outlets that one company can own. Why would that be a good idea? I mean, I understand that you and your friends would make some more money, but I really don't think that should be the criteria upon which you make this decision. I'm sorry but I'm not dumb enough to believe that the 50 largest media companies spending \$111.3 million to influence Congress and the executive branch between 1996 and 2000 is "free-market capitalism." They look at these expenses as an investment - they would not have spent that money unless they thought that they would get a good return on it. For example, the Broadcasting Industry contributed five million dollars to the campaigns of George W. Bush and Al Gore (they contributed to both to hedge their bets, I don't blame them, why pick a side when it could cost you?) For this investment the industry got free digital TV licenses - a seventy billion dollar value! That's a 1,400,000% return on their investment! And let's not forget that the \$111.3 million had to go somewhere. Now, a hundred million dollars may seem paltry to you, but in the real world that's a lot of money. I know a lot of people who could use that money for much needed food (in 1999, 31 million Americans (12 million of whom were children) were food insecure, meaning they were either hungry or unsure of where their next meal would come from), housing, or healthcare (about 43 million Americans don't have any). But I'm sure they would understand if you and your friends felt that you needed another car or another house or a new swimming pool or whatever you spent your kickback on.

So, the bottom line is that deregulation will not help the public at all, and we know it. I cannot even begin to tell you how many emails I've gotten (some from people I haven't heard from in years who have NEVER taken an interest in anything political before) about how upsetting it is that you would even consider this move. Yes, we're on to you. So don't give away anymore of our airwaves. Keep the restrictions on how many media outlets one company can own (in fact, increase the restrictions). Decreasing the restrictions only means that we get less points of view and less options in our media - and that's not freedom of the press.

Oh, and while you're at it, increase funding for the Public Broadcasting System, the National Public Radio, and the National Endowment for the Arts. Those are all things that the public actually wants. If I hear about you messing with any of those...

Incredibly pissed off and watching your every move,  
Johannah Westmacott

155 W. 60th, 7K1  
New York, NY 10023

CC: Kathleen Abernathy



**From:** Slarrydude@wmconnect.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:31 PM  
**Subject:** (no subject)

Mr. Adelstein, I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near control of radio and television news and information in countries across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country. Sincerely, Dude Starnes

**From:** Konnie Wager  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:32 PM  
**Subject:** Media Ownship

We are concerned with the proposed Media Ownership regulation changes being discussed. We feel that there has not been adequate public debate or reporting by the media to inform the public majority on the affects of the potential changes. We are opposed to allowing fewer companies to own and control more radio stations that utilize the public airwaves.

We have noticed the canned and controlled dissemination of news information that is not relevant to our region and also the decreasing amount of time dedicated to unbiased reporting.

We hope you will consider the long term affects of the pending decisions and its importance to our democracy. Thank you.

Jack and Konnie Wager  
15000 NW 21st Ave  
Vancouver, Wa 98685

**From:** Hall  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:32 PM  
**Subject:** broadcast ownership rules

Dear FCC Commissioners,

I would strongly urge you NOT relax the rules for broadcast ownership. Huge media corporations would then dominate the news, and could very well stifle the interplay of ideas necessary for a democracy. Many people do not get cable TV, and we are one of those families. We get three independent news channels now, and that is the way we like it. I would not want only one inevitably biased voice to penetrate my house. It is to be noted that the media do have an effect on public opinion by what they reveal and more importantly by what they do not reveal.

My best regards to all of you.

J. Frederick Hall

**CC:** kabernath@fcc.gov, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** chas christian  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:36 PM  
**Subject:** Media Concentration

May 4, 2003

Dear Commissioner Copps,

The latest proposal to further concentrate the ownership of broadcast totally ignores the fact that the airwaves are owned by the public, and the notion that broadcast media is supposed to operate in the public interest.

Ownership concentration is increasingly moving the broadcast media into becoming a single point of view propaganda source very similar to the Pravda of the USSR.

The ownership concentration of the media and the repeal of the fairness doctrine have turned over the publicly owned airwaves to corporations that present news as politically slanted entertainment, and has turned entertainment programming into absolute garbage.

The FOX network and their coverage of the current events, the Clear Channel group and their computer controlled network of stations, and endless sitcoms that have to tell you when to laugh, are perfect examples of how the public airwaves have been turned into propaganda and advertising outlets.

Charles Christian  
2127 Red Rose Way  
Santa Barbara, CA 93109

**From:** Bob Cannistraro  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:39 PM  
**Subject:** new rules to loosen restrictions on media conglomeration

Dear Chairman Powell

I am very against any changing of the rules to loosen restricions on media conglomeration. I feel that the existing conglomerates (i.e. Clearchannel) already are able to own too many outlets.

Sincerely,

Bob Cannistraro  
4620 Talbot Drive  
Boulder, CO 80303

**From:** Michael Andreas  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:52 PM  
**Subject:** Multiple station ownership

Mr. Chairman Powell,

I would like to add my voice to the growing list of citizens who are opposed to allowing a few large conglomerates to own the vast majority of the primary and secondary media outlets in the United States.

I have read statements from all spectra of our society, from the extremes of the left and right and everyone in between, all of whom seem to express the same feeling, that our country is not well served by having our media outlets controlled by a small handful of very wealthy people.

At the present rate, if no real limits on ownership are imposed, media ownership throughout the United States will be restricted to only very wealthy individuals and corporations.

The danger and anti-American result of this, should be obvious to anyone. The freedoms we enjoy are based on our Constitution, the first amendment to which assures us Freedom of expression... but nowadays, to freely express ourselves to our fellow citizens, we need the media access to get the word out.. If what we have to say, might not be something these media moguls want to hear... and if we have no other access to the airwaves, our basic rights become worthless. This bandwidth is owned by the people and as such, should (as best as possible), be available to a vast cross-section of them.

The decision you are about to make will set the direction our country will take for as long as our flag waves. Let it wave over a truly free country, one who's media represents all our voices, not just those of the very wealthy

God Bless,

Michael Andreas

**From:** Michael Andreas  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:55 PM  
**Subject:** Copy of letter sent to Chairman Powell

Mr. Chairman Powell,

I would like to add my voice to the growing list of citizens who are opposed to allowing a few large conglomerates to own the vast majority of the primary and secondary media outlets in the United States.

I have read statements from all spectra of our society, from the extremes of the left and right and everyone in between, all of whom seem to express the same feeling, that our country is not well served by having our media outlets controlled by a small handful of very wealthy people.

At the present rate, if no real limits on ownership are imposed, media ownership throughout the United States will be restricted to only very wealthy individuals and corporations.

The danger and anti-American result of this, should be obvious to anyone. The freedoms we enjoy are based on our Constitution, the first amendment to which assures us Freedom of expression... but nowadays, to freely express ourselves to our fellow citizens, we need the media access to get the word out.. If what we have to say, might not be something these media moguls want to hear... and if we have no other access to the airwaves, our basic rights become worthless. This bandwidth is owned by the people and as such, should (as best as possible), be available to a vast cross-section of them.

The decision you are about to make will set the direction our country will take for as long as our flag waves. Let it wave over a truly free country, one who's media represents all our voices, not just those of the very wealthy

God Bless,

Michael Andreas

**From:** ricochet1221@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, mcopps@fccgov.fcc.gov, kimweb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 4:38 PM  
**Subject:** Relaxing rules of Broadcast Ownership

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen of the FCC:

Power in the hands of few is dangerous. It wreaks of dictatorship and frankly, the working man presently has a full plate of dictatorship from corporations. Relaxing the constraints on Broadcast Ownership would be a dirtect contribution to people control.

Retirees from large corporations have been feeling the heat for years by change of management and who by eliminating policies that existed for years claim poor mouth as an excuse to justify cuts in medical and retirement benefits. Relax the rules on Broadcast Ownership and you'll only open up addition avenues of abuse.

I appreciate your consideration in this matter. Thank you,

James T. Maguire  
41 Randolph St.,  
Park Ridge, NJ 07656

201-391-9144



**From:** James J Courtney  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 4:41 PM  
**Subject:** 35% Ownership Rule

Dear Mr. Copps,

I am writing you in an urgent request to seriously consider that the proposal before you on June 2nd, 2003 that would allow any one entity to hold more than a 35% share in our media is a recipe for disaster. Already our media has been lambasted as being almost entirely the tool of multi-national corporations and government agendas, and with good reason. For a free country, we do not have a very free press.

As a journalism major at the University of South Carolina, the sixth ranked journalism school at the time I attended, a wonderful law and ethics professor, Mark Etheridge, the former editor of the Detroit Free Press, left us with words I found to be both cautionary and prophetic. He asked "who owns the news source, and what do they want you to know?"

With a diverse and varied ownership of our media, we at least have the potential of a free press. If we allow the mega-corporations to gain more control of our media, we are inviting the same levels of tyranny that strangled Soviet Russians, and is conspicuously already limiting the amount and accuracy of information we as Americans enjoy. I know this, because I take the time to read the foreign press, in addition to our own.

At a time when our Constitution is being ransacked, and the very life we know as Americans is under attack, I implore you to do the honorable thing. Deny those self same entities the privilege of controlling our media. Our very freedoms depend on it.

Sincerely,

James J. Courtney, N.D.

**From:** jackbneill@att.net  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 4:45 PM  
**Subject:** concern over rule changes

Dear Mr. Copps,

I just listened to your interview with Bill Moyers on NOW  
I have followed the pending changes in the rules that govern communications, media and the general public a little bit. I am stunned by what i have heard. I disagree with any effort that will result in the consolidation of power and narrowing of the media outlets available to the public. I have serious concerns already about the manipulation the media has on public opinion and changes to the current rules will just worsen the situation. As you have said, the airwaves and Internet? belong to the public. It is a global common of sorts that needs careful oversight by the government and public interest groups.

I admire your efforts to raise awarenss among the public and am disappointed by those that appear not to care. Please continue your efforts and pass along my lone voice of dissent to whomever it might make a difference.

peacefully yours,  
andy neill  
joliet, Illinois

**CC:** aneill@jjc.edu

We are very concerned about the planned vote on June 2 by the FCC commissioners on communication decisions that will affect how airwaves are regulated. Citizens should be talking about this issue, but due to the media not reporting on it, people don't understand the impact of the proposed rules changes.

The airwaves and the broadcast spectra belong to the people and should be regulated for the people. We urge you to delay the vote and hold public hearings so an informed decision can be made. We personally don't want a few companies controlling the airwaves. We want a diversity of opinions expressed.

It appears to us that the FCC Chairman has not been willing to open up the discussion to the public. We are asking that this be changed so the people can know the issues involved and help the commission to make an informed decision.

Respectfully, Carl and Dorothy Thorman

**From:** gblume1@juno.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 5:07 PM  
**Subject:** Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Gerald Blume  
6945 Keith Rd.  
Clermont, Georgia 30527-1504

cc:  
Senator Saxby Chambliss  
Representative Nathan Deal  
Senator Zell Miller

**From:** Steven Marx  
**To:** Mike Powell, KM KJMWEB, Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 5:09 PM  
**Subject:** Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation.

Dear Commissioner

Further consolidation of the media in the name of "deregulation" must be halted. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide unbiased information about most crucial issues, most notably the recent coverage of the war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to challenge the media conglomerates, to open the broadcast spectrum to a diverse range of journalists and opinions, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine. Oppose media deregulation.

Steven Marx  
265 Albert  
San Luis Obispo CA 93405

**From:** L.F.Desmond  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 5:15 PM  
**Subject:** I urge you NOT to relax th broadcast ownership rules.....

I Urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of biew on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Linda F. Desmond  
North Andover, Massachusetts 01845-1218